Remarks/Arguments:

Claim Status

Claims 1-17 are presently pending and all claims stand rejected. Applicant herein amends claims 1 and 8. Support for the claim amendments are found throughout the specification as originally filed. For example, at page 10, lines 20-24. No new matter is added.

Response to Art Rejections

Rejection of Claims 1, 6-8, 12, 16 and 17

Claims 1, 6-8, 12, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,754,905 to Gordon et al. (herein "Gordon"). This ground for rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1

Claim 1 as amended includes at least one limitation (step) that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Gordon. Claim 1 recites the following steps:

> (b) placing a plurality of time selection fields on the display, the plurality of time selection fields representing respective incremental time indexes having respectively different magnitudes, each time selection field configured to be activated responsive to receipt of the user action command corresponding to the single action key;
>
> (c) selecting one time selection field of the plurality of time selection fields by positioning the cursor on the one time selection field;
>
> (d) activating the selected time selection field to select the respective incremental time index responsive to receipt of the user action command corresponding to the single action key while the cursor is positioned on the one time selection field;
>
> (e) calculating a new time of transmission for display by adding the selected incremental time index to one of the times of transmission currently displayed.

This means that an incremental time index for incrementing (or decrementing) times of transmission for display by a program guide is selected by selecting and activating one of a

plurality of time selection fields displayed by the program guide. Each time selection field has a respective incremental time index (e.g., 1.5 hours, 6 hours, 1 day, 1 week) that can each be activated responsive to a user action command corresponding to a single action key. A time selection field is selected by positioning a cursor on the time selection field and the selected time selection field is then activated in response to receipt of the user action command corresponding to the single action key while the cursor is positioned on the time selection filed. Once activated, the respective incremental time index of the activated time selection field is used to calculate new transmission times for display.

Gordon, on the other hand, discloses a day of week identification object 631, a time of day object 639, a next time slot object 634, and a temporal increment/decrement object 632. See col. 18, lines 40-45 of Gordon. In Gordon, "[w]hen [an] image region is active ([i.e.] any of objects 631-638 emphasized), the up and down arrow keys are used to adjust the presently indicated next time slot object 634, while the page up and page down keys are used to adjust the day of the week identification object." See col. 28, lines 61-65 of Gordon (Emphasis added). Thus, in Gordon, different keys are used to adjust different time objects (i.e., up/down arrows keys and page up/down keys). In the invention recited by claim 1, however, a time index is selected through (1) selection of a time selection field by positioning a cursor on a particular time selection field (which represents a respective incremental time index) and (2) activation of the selected time selection field responsive to receipt of a user action command that corresponds to a single action key associated with a user interface. Thus, unlike Gordon in which different keys are used for activation, in claim 1 a single key (e.g., an ACTION key) is used to activate a selected time selection field and, thus, select the time index. Further, in claim 1 the same key is used for activation of each selected time selection field (i.e., the single action key) rather than different keys (i.e., up/down arrow keys and page up/down keys as in Gordon. Hence, for the reasons discussed above, Gordon fails to disclose, teach, or suggest selecting an incremental time index of a program guide from a plurality of time index fields with a single key. Further, none of the cited art disclose, teach, or suggest this feature.

Having a plurality of time index fields on the display and incrementing the time of transmission for display based on the selected and activated field provides a more intuitive interface than is provided by Gordon. Furthermore, it requires fewer keys of a user interface to implement. The subject invention requires one key (e.g., an ACTION key) to

activate a selected time selection field to select one of a plurality of time indexes, whereas Gordon requires at least four keys to increment just two time periods (i.e., up/down arrow keys for 1 and ½ hour increments and page up/down keys for 24 hour increments).

In response to applicant's arguments filed September 8, 2005, the Office Action recites that "claim 1 does not recite[] 'a single key to determine a respective time index for increasing a displayed time of transmission'". Although applicant believes that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim this aspect of the invention, applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 to recite as an element of the claims that the action key is a single key in order to further prosecution.

For the reasons discussed above, the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of independent claim 1. Accordingly, applicant contends that claim 1 is allowable over Gordon and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim 8

Claim 8, as amended, while not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to claim 1. Accordingly, applicant contends that claim 8 is also allowable over Gordon for the reasons set forth above and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 7, 12, 16, and 17

Claims 6, 7, 12, 16, and 17 include all of the features of either independent claim 1 or independent claim 8, from which they ultimately depend. Thus, claims 6, 7, 12, 16, and 17 are also allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, applicant contends that claims 6, 7, 12, 16, and 17 are likewise allowable and, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 6, 7, 12, 16, and 17 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 5, 14, and 15

Claims 5, 14, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Gordon. This ground for rejection is respectfully traversed. As described above, neither Gordon nor any of the art of record disclose, teach, or suggest multiple time selection fields

that may be selected and then activated with a single key to determine a respective time index for incrementing a displayed time of transmission. Thus, claims 1 and 8 are not obvious in view of Gordon (or any of the art of record) and, thus, claims 5, 14, and 15, which ultimately depend from one of claims 1 and 8, are also allowable. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 5, 14, and 15 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 9 and 10

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Gordon in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,025,869 to Stas et al. (herein "Stas"). This ground for rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 9 and 10 each ultimately depend from claim 8 and include all of the features and limitations of claim 8. The feature that was found to be lacking in Gordon with reference to claims 1 and 8 is not found in Stas, namely, multiple time selection fields that may be selected and then activated with a single key to determine a respective time index to increment a displayed time of transmission. Thus, Stas fails to make up for the deficiencies of Gordon. Accordingly, applicant contends that claims 9 and 10 are allowable and respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 9 and 10 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 11

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Gordon in view of Stas and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,621 to Pezzillo et al. (herein "Pezzillo"). This ground for rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 11 depends from claim 8 and includes all of the features and limitations of claim 8. The feature that was found to be lacking in Gordon and Stas with reference to claims 1, 8, and 10 is not found in Pezzillo, namely, multiple time selection fields that may be selected and then activated with a single key to determine a respective time index to increment a displayed time of transmission. Thus, Pezzillo fails to make up for the deficiencies of Gordon and Stas. Accordingly, applicant contends that claim 11 is allowable and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 2 and 3

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Gordon in view of Pezzillo and Stas. This ground for rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 2

and 3 each ultimately depend from claim 1 and includes all of the features and limitations of claim 1. The feature that was found to be lacking in Gordon with reference to claim 1 are not found in Stas and Pezzillo, namely, multiple time selection fields that may be selected and then activated with a single key to determine a respective time index to increment a displayed time of transmission. Thus, Stas and Pezzillo fail to make up for the deficiencies of Gordon. Accordingly, applicant contends that claims 2 and 3 are allowable and respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2 and 3 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 4 and 13

Claims 4 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Gordon in view of US Published Application No. 2003/0066085 to Boyer et al. (herein "Boyer"). This ground for rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 4 and 13 depend from claims 1 and 8, respectively, and include all of the features and limitations of claims 1 and 8, respectively. The feature that was found to be lacking in Gordon with reference to claims 1 and 8 is not found in Boyer, namely, multiple time selection fields that may be selected and then activated with a single key to determine a respective time index to increment a displayed time of transmission. Thus, Boyer fails to make up for the deficiencies of Gordon. Accordingly, applicant contends that claims 4 and 13 are allowable and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 4 and 13 be withdrawn.

MATP-598US

Appln. No.: 09/630,534
Amendment Dated January 31, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 3, 2005

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1-17.

Respectfully submitted,

RatnerPrestia

Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549
Stephen J. Weed, Reg. No. 45,202
Attorneys for Applicant

SJW/kpc

Dated: January 31, 2006

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. **18-0350** of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (571)273-8300 on January 31, 2006.

Kathleen P. Carney

Kathleen P. Carney